



UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS  
Washington, D.C. 20231

| SERIAL NUMBER | FILING DATE | FIRST NAMED INVENTOR | ATTORNEY DOCKET NO. |
|---------------|-------------|----------------------|---------------------|
| 007411,581    | 03/29/95    | SINOFSKY             |                     |

E B0410/7228

THOMAS J. ENGELLENTER, ESQ.  
LAHIVE & COCKFIELD  
60 STATE STREET  
BOSTON MA 02109

33M1/0708

EXAMINER

ART UNIT 3311 - PAPER NUMBER

3311

DATE MAILED: 07/08/97

This is a communication from the examiner in charge of your application.  
COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS

☒ This application has been examined ☒ Responsive to communication filed on April 11, 1997 ☐ This action is made final.

A shortened statutory period for response to this action is set to expire 3 month(s),        days from the date of this letter.  
Failure to respond within the period for response will cause the application to become abandoned. 35 U.S.C. 133

Part I THE FOLLOWING ATTACHMENT(S) ARE PART OF THIS ACTION:

- |   |   |
|---|---|
| 1. <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited by Examiner, PTO-892. | 2. <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsman's Patent Drawing Review, PTO-948. |
| 3. <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Art Cited by Applicant, PTO-1449.                 | 4. <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application, PTO-152.       |
| 5. <input type="checkbox"/> Information on How to Effect Drawing Changes, PTO-1474.     | 6. <input type="checkbox"/>   |

Part II SUMMARY OF ACTION

1. ☒ Claims 60-72 are pending in the application.

Of the above, claims        are withdrawn from consideration.

2. ☒ Claims 1-59 have been cancelled.

3. ☐ Claims        are allowed.

4. ☒ Claims 60-72 are rejected.

5. ☐ Claims        are objected to.

6. ☐ Claims        are subject to restriction or election requirement.

7. ☐ This application has been filed with Informal drawings under 37 C.F.R. 1.85 which are acceptable for examination purposes.

8. ☐ Formal drawings are required in response to this Office action.

9. ☐ The corrected or substitute drawings have been received on       . Under 37 C.F.R. 1.84 these drawings are ☐ acceptable; ☐ not acceptable (see explanation or Notice of Draftsman's Patent Drawing Review, PTO-948).

10. ☐ The proposed additional or substitute sheet(s) of drawings, filed on       , has (have) been ☐ approved by the examiner; ☐ disapproved by the examiner (see explanation).

11. ☐ The proposed drawing correction, filed       , has been ☐ approved; ☐ disapproved (see explanation).

12. ☐ Acknowledgement is made of the claim for priority under 35 U.S.C. 119. The certified copy has ☐ been received ☐ not been received ☐ been filed in parent application, serial no.       ; filed on       .

13. ☐ Since this application appears to be in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under Ex parte Quayle, 1935 C.D. 11; 453 O.G. 213.

14. ☐ Other

EXAMINER'S ACTION

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. § 103 which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

Subject matter developed by another person, which qualifies as prior art only under subsection (f) or (g) of section 102 of this title, shall not preclude patentability under this section where the subject matter and the claimed invention were, at the time the invention was made, owned by the same person or subject to an obligation of assignment to the same person.

Claims 60-72 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103 as being unpatentable over Peyman in view of Eisenberg. Peyman teaches a system as claimed except for the particular light source and optical fiber material. Eisenberg teaches the desirability of using an Erbium laser for tissue repair <sup>or</sup> ~~en~~ removal. It would have been obvious to the artisan of ordinary skill to employ an <sup>Er: YLF</sup> ~~Erbium~~ laser to perform the surgery since <sup>this</sup> ~~there~~ is appropriate for tissue removal and repair, as taught by Eisenberg and to use <sup>Holmium</sup> ~~Helium~~, Erbium, and Thulium as the <sup>lasing ions</sup> ~~layering~~ core, since <sup>these</sup> ~~this~~ are known to produce wavelength the in the ranges disclosed by <sup>Peyman</sup> ~~Peperman~~, judicial notice of which is hereby taken, are equivalents, are not critical, and provide no unexpected result; to employ YLF or YAG as the crystal substrates, since these are widely used as substitutes for <sup>lasing ions</sup> ~~judicial notice of which is hereby taken are equivalent and produce~~

9B no unexpected result; to employ a <sup>low</sup>~~low~~ hydroxyl <sup>ion</sup>~~ion~~ content fiber,  
9B since these were commercially available and known to <sup>transmit</sup>~~treatment~~ the  
9B desired wavelength at the time of the <sup>invention</sup>~~conventions~~ and to employ the  
claimed pulse width and repetition rates, since these are not  
critical, are well known in the art, and would provide efficient  
tissue removal or repair without excessive heating of surrounding  
tissue for the disclosed irradiated area, judicial notice of which  
are hereby taken, thus producing a device such as claimed.

9B Claims 60-72 are rejected under the judicially created  
doctrine of obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable  
over claims <sup>1-4,</sup>~~6-9,~~ and 15-41 of U.S. Patent No. 4,950,266. Although  
the conflicting claims are not identical, they are not patentably  
distinct from each other because it would have been obvious to  
include various unclaimed structures (e.g. focussing lens at  
9B <sup>proximal</sup>~~proximal~~ fiber <sup>end</sup>~~end~~ and diameter of surgical <sup>site</sup>~~site~~) as they are  
9B <sup>in the art</sup>~~conventional~~ is thought, <sup>thus</sup>~~this~~ producing a device such as claimed.

9B Claims 60-72 are rejected under the judicially created  
doctrine of obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable  
over claims <sup>1-16.</sup>~~60-72~~ of U.S. Patent No. 4,917,084. Although the  
conflicting claims are not identical, they are not patentably  
distinct from each other because it would have been obvious to  
include various unclaimed structures which are inherently necessary  
(e.g. means for coupling the laser energy to the fiber) or  
conventional (e.g. means attached to the distal end of the fiber  
directing the laser energy ...) thus providing a device such as

Serial No. 411,581  
Art Unit 3311

-4-

claimed.


Claims 60-72 are rejected under the judicially created doctrine of obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claims 1-32 of U.S. Patent No. 5,196,004. Although the conflicting claims are not identical, they are not patentably distinct from each other because of substantially same <sup>reasons</sup> ~~reasons~~ set forth in the double patenting rejection concerning U.S. Patent number 4,950,266.

The obviousness-type double patenting rejection is a judicially established doctrine based upon public policy and is primarily intended to prevent prolongation of the patent term by prohibiting claims in a second patent not patentably distinct from claims in a first patent. *In re Vogel*, 164 USPQ 619 (CCPA 1970). A timely filed terminal disclaimer in compliance with 37 C.F.R. § 1.321(b) would overcome an actual or provisional rejection on this ground provided the conflicting application or patent is shown to be commonly owned with this application. See 37 C.F.R. § 1.78(d).

The claims are additionally rejected under non-statutory, no obviousness type double patenting over the claims and patents set forth above as set forth in *In re Schneller* 397 F. 2d 350, 158 USPQ 210 (CCPA 1962).

Any inquiry concerning this communication should be directed to David Shay at telephone number (703) 308-2215.

David Shay:bhw  
July 2, 1997

  
JENNIFER BAHR  
PRIMARY EXAMINER  
GROUP 3300